



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/064,665	08/05/2002	John William Carbone	126726	5321

41838 7590 03/14/2008
GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY (PCPI)
C/O FLETCHER YODER
P. O. BOX 692289
HOUSTON, TX 77269-2289

EXAMINER

SHEIKH, ASFAND M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3627

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

03/14/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/064,665

Applicant(s)

CARBONE ET AL.

Examiner

Asfand M. Sheikh

Art Unit

3627

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 December 2007.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-50 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-50 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 05 August 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
5) ☐ Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
6) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
7) ☐ Other: _____
8) ☐ Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

DETAILED ACTION

In view of the Appeal Brief filed on 12/06/2007, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. New grounds of rejection are set forth below.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

(1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,

(2) initiate a new appeal by filing a notice of appeal under 37 CFR 41.31 followed by an appeal brief under 37 CFR 41.37. The previously paid notice of appeal fee and appeal brief fee can be applied to the new appeal. If, however, the appeal fees set forth in 37 CFR 41.20 have been increased since they were previously paid, then appellant must pay the difference between the increased fees and the amount previously paid.

A Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) has approved of reopening prosecution by signing below:

/F. Ryan Zeender/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3627

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments, Appeal Brief filed on 12/06/2007, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-6, 10, 16, 17, 24, 26-31, 42, 42, 45, 49 an under 35 USC 102(e) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Marsh (US 2003/0023517 A1) in view of Maltseff (US 2002/00997282 A1).

Official Notice

The examiner notes the applicant has not properly traversed the limitations regarding the Examiner's Official Notice taken in the last action dated in 5/4/2007. The applicant's have not provided a reason to **why** the Examiner's Official Notice is not proper. Therefore the elements of the Examiner's Official Notice is made of record.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 1-6, 16-17, 20, 24, 26-31, 41-42, 45, and 49 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marsh (US 2003/0023517 A1) in view of Maltseff (US 2002/00997282 A1).

As per claims 1-6, 16-17, 20, 26-31, 41-42 and 45, Marsh discloses affixing a plurality of electronic asset identification devices to an asset whose location and information are to be managed (0020-0022; 0031; FIG. 1); programming each of the plurality of electronic asset identification devices to include at least unique identification information relating to the asset to which it is affixed (0020-0022; 0031; FIG. 1); maintaining at least one database containing information regarding the electronic asset identification devices and the assets to which they are affixed on an asset management server computer system (0020-0022; 0028; 0031; FIG. 1); operatively connecting a field control device operating a computer program to the asset management server computer system for exchanging information regarding the electronic asset identification devices over a computer network

(0020-0022; 0028; 0031; FIG. 1); and further the field control device having the ability to interrogate the electronic asset identification devices in order to receive information from the plurality of electronic asset identification devices (0020-0022; 0028; 0031; FIG. 1).

However Marsh fails to disclose wherein the field control device is a remote client computer system operatively connected to the asset management system and further the remote client computer system contains at least one interrogation device that is separate from the remote client computer in which the interrogation device interrogates information from the electronic asset identification devices and sends the asset information to the remote client computer system.

Maltseff discloses a field control device (0031 and FIG. 2: "20") that is operatively connected to an asset management system (0031 and FIG. 2: "18") and further the remote client computer system contains at least one interrogation device (0030-0031 and FIG. 2: "28") that is separate from the remote client computer (0030-0031: interface between the wireless interrogator and the personal computer and FIG. 2: "34") in which the interrogation device interrogates information from the electronic asset identification devices (0030 and FIG. 2: "30") and sends the asset information to the remote client computer

system (0030-0031). Further the remote client computer system sends the asset information from the electronic asset identification devices to the asset management system (0031).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Marsh to include wherein the field control device is a remote client computer system operatively connected to the asset management system and further the remote client computer system contains at least one interrogation device that is separate from the remote client computer in which the interrogation device interrogates information from the electronic asset identification devices and sends the asset information to the remote client computer system as taught by the Maltseff. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings in order allow for tracking information via a wireless memory device and storing the information at a central computer system (Maltseff, 0006).

As per claim 24 and 49, Marsh discloses synchronizing local asset management information with asset management information received from the asset management server computer system for a selected group of assets (0028).

Art Unit: 3627

Claims 7, 15, 32 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marsh (US 2003/0023517 A1) in view of Maltseff (US 2002/00997282 A1) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Examiner's Official Notice.

As per claim 7 and 32, Marsh in view of Maltseff fails to explicitly disclose operatively connecting at least one legacy database system to the asset management server computer system, for enabling exchange of legacy information relating to the assets to be managed.

However, the Examiner takes Official Notice that it is notoriously old and well known in the art connect a server computer system to a legacy database in order to exchange information.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Marsh in view of Maltseff to include connecting a server computer system to a legacy database in order to exchange information as taught by the Official Notice. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings in order to allow the movement and merging of information from an older established data repository to a newer data repository.

As per claim 15 and 40, Marsh in view of Maltseff discloses a computing device as the remote client device.

Marsh fails to explicitly disclose wherein the remote client computer system is a laptop or notebook style computer system.

However, the Examiner takes Official Notice that it is notoriously old and well known in the art to utilize a laptop or notebook style computer in a computing environment.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Marsh to include utilizing a laptop or notebook style computer in a computing environment as taught by the Official Notice. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings in order to allow a user the portability offered by a laptop/notebook style computer.

Claim 8 and 33 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marsh (US 2003/0023517 A1) in view of Maltseff (US 2002/00997282 A1) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Bothman et al. (US 2003/0101108 A1).

As per claim 8 and 33, Marsh discloses a user interface for presenting interpreted data (0028).

Marsh in view of Maltseff fails to explicitly serving a plurality of interactive web pages relating to the asset identification devices and the assets to which they are affixed from at least one web application server computer system.

However Bothman discloses serving a plurality of interactive web pages relating to the asset identification devices and the assets to which they are affixed from at least one web application server computer system (ABSTRACT).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Marsh in view of Maltseff to include serving a plurality of interactive web pages relating to the asset identification devices and the assets to which they are affixed from at least one web application server computer system as taught by Bothman. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings in order to portray accurate information related to the assets to users of the system in a quick and accurate manner (Bothman; 0008).

Claims 9-10, 14, 34-35, and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marsh (US 2003/0023517 A1) in view of Maltseff (US 2002/00997282 A1) and Bothman et al. (US

2003/0101108 A1) as applied to claim 8 and 33 above, and further in view of Ahlberg et al. (US 6,587,836 B1).

As per claim 9, 14, 34 and 39, Marsh in view of Maltseff both fail to explicitly disclose operatively connecting at least one hypertext transfer protocol server computer system to the web application server computer system; and operatively connecting at least one authentication server computer system to the hypertext transfer protocol server for performing authentication and logon services, wherein the authentication server computer system is further operatively connected to an LDAP directory system for facilitating user login and authentication, wherein information exchanges initiated by the remote client computer system result in a first connection between the remote client computer system and the at least one authentication server computer system.

Bothman discloses a web application server (ABSTRACT).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Marsh in view of Maltseff to include a web application server as taught by Bothman. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings in order to portray

accurate information related to the assets to users of the system in a quick and accurate manner.

Marsh, Maltseff, and Bothman all fail to explicitly disclose and operatively connecting at least one authentication server computer system to the hypertext transfer protocol server for performing authentication and logon services, wherein the authentication server computer system is further operatively connected to an LDAP directory system for facilitating user login and authentication, wherein information exchanges initiated by the remote client computer system result in a first connection between the remote client computer system and the at least one authentication server computer system.

However Ahlberg discloses a user at a web browser using HTTP-S to a server (hypertext transfer protocol server) and providing a user name/password at a remote client computer system connecting which connects to an authentication server which matches the provided user name/password with a security profile before granting access to the system (col. 10, lines 42-61 and col. 20, lines 12-52; FIG. 5; Examiner interprets "security profile" to be a directory system for authentication and logon services). **The Examiner notes the Ahlberg is analogous art for providing web based logon authentication system for displaying web pages.**

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Marsh, Maltseff, and Bothman to include a user at a web browser providing a user name/password at a remote client computer system connecting which connects to an authentication server which matches the provided user name/password with a security profile before granting access to the system as taught by Ahlberg. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings in order to provide a web-based on-line system for processing data for services over the Internet (Ahlberg; col. 3, lines 14-17).

As per claim 10 and 35, Marsh discloses a user interface for presenting interpreted data (0028).

Bothman discloses displaying web pages to allow for modifying, rejecting, or accepting information related to data (ABSTRACT).

Ahlberg discloses web pages for presenting options, entry, modifying, canceling, searching, displaying information, customized reports, etc (ABSTRACT; col. 3, lines 61-67; col. 4, lines 1-23; col. 9, lines 29-48; and col. 16, lines 16-32).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings

of Marsh, Maltseff, Bothman, and Ahlberg to include displaying a home page; displaying a login page for receiving user login information; displaying a main menu page for displaying a plurality of options to users, selection of which a user to view and/or modify the asset management information maintained on the asset management web server computer system; displaying a project details page for displaying general information regarding asset management information relating to a selected project; displaying an asset search page for receiving asset search criteria from the user, the submission of which causes the asset management web server computer system to retrieve asset management information matching the submitted search criteria; displaying an asset search results page for displaying the retrieved asset management information; and displaying an asset details page for displaying specific asset management information relating to a selected one of the assets displayed on the asset search results page. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings in order to provide multiple web based pages that relate to pertinent information that should be able to be viewed online. **The Examiner would like to note limitations recited in claim 10 and 35 are directed to design choice for providing information catered to a specific environment.**

Claims 11-13 and 36-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marsh (US 2003/0023517 A1) in view of Maltseff (US 2002/00997282 A1) and Bothman et al. (US 2003/0101108 A1) and Ahlberg et al. (US 6,587,836 B1) as applied to claim 10 and 35 above, and further in view of Fleskes (US 6,529,910 B1)

As per claim 11 and 36, Marsh, Maltseff, Bothman, and Ahlberg all fail to explicitly disclose operatively connection at least one authentication server computer system to the web application server computer system for facilitating user login and authentication, wherein the web server application serves different web pages depending upon login information received from the remote client computer system.

However Fleskes discloses displaying different web pages depending upon login information received (ABSTRACT). **The Examiner notes the Fleskes is analogous art for providing different web pages depending upon login information received.**

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Marsh, Maltseff, Bothman, and Ahlberg to include displaying different web pages depending upon login information received as taught by Fleskes. One of ordinary skill in the art would have

been motivated to combine the teachings in order to provide varying levels of information that are available to the users of the system (ABSTRACT).

As per claims 12 and 37, Marsh discloses a user interface for presenting interpreted data (0028).

Bothman discloses displaying web pages to allow for modifying, rejecting, or accepting information related to data (ABSTRACT).

Ahlberg discloses web pages for presenting options, entry, modifying, canceling, searching, displaying information, customized reports, etc (ABSTRACT; col. 3, lines 61-67; col. 4, lines 1-23; col. 9, lines 29-48; and col. 16, lines 16-32).

Fleskes discloses displaying different web pages depending upon login information received (ABSTRACT).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Marsh, Maltseff, Bothman, Ahlberg, and Fleskes to include receiving administrative level user login information; displaying a show report menu page for enabling users to select and create reports of available asset management information; displaying a synchronize web page for receiving file information for a file to be synchronized; displaying an asset receipt form

web page for receiving a user indication regarding receipt of an asset; displaying an asset exception annotation web page for receiving information regarding an exception to be added to a selected asset; displaying an asset exception list page for displaying a listing of asset management exceptions associated with a selected project; and displaying a resolve asset exception web page, wherein users may indicate that a selected exception has been resolved. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings in order to provide varying levels of information that are available to the users of the system. **The Examiner would like to note limitations recited in claim 37 are directed to design choice for providing information catered to a specific environment.**

As per claims 13 and 38, Marsh discloses a user interface for presenting interpreted data (0028).

Bothman discloses displaying web pages to allow for modifying, rejecting, or accepting information related to data (ABSTRACT).

Ahlberg discloses web pages for presenting options, entry, modifying, canceling, searching, displaying information, customized reports, etc (ABSTRACT; col. 3, lines 61-67; col. 4, lines 1-23; col. 9, lines 29-48; and col. 16, lines 16-32).

Fleskes discloses displaying different web pages depending upon login information received (ABSTRACT).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Marsh, Maltseff, Bothman, Ahlberg, and Fleskes to include receiving material handling level user login information; displaying a synchronize web page for receiving file information for a file to be synchronized; displaying an asset receipt form web page for receiving a user indication regarding receipt of an asset; displaying an asset exception annotation web page for receiving information regarding an exception to be added to a selected asset; displaying an asset exception list page for displaying a listing of asset management exceptions associated with a selected project; displaying an asset storage maintenance details web page for displaying asset management information relating to the storage and maintenance of a selected asset; displaying an asset location form web page for displaying the physical location of a selected asset; and displaying an update asset location form web page for receiving updated asset location information for a selected asset. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings in order to provide varying levels of information that are available to the users of the system. **The Examiner would**

like to note limitations recited in claim 38 are directed to design choice for providing information catered to a specific environment.

Claim 18-19 and 43-44 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marsh (US 2003/0023517 A1) in view of Maltseff (US 2002/00997282 A1) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Ahlberg et al. (US 6,587,836 B1).

As per claim 18 and 43, Marsh discloses modifying information contained on the asset management computer system (0028).

Marsh in view of Maltseff fails to explicitly disclose operatively connecting additional remote client computer systems to the asset management server computer system for enabling users to access and modify information contained on the asset management computer system.

However Ahlberg discloses connecting additional remote client computer systems to the asset management server for enabling users to access and modify information (col. 3, lines 61-67 and col. 4, lines 1-24).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings

of Marsh in view of Maltseff to include connecting additional remote client computer systems to the asset management server for enabling users to access and modify information as taught by Ahlberg. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings in order to provide a web-based on-line system for processing data for services over the Internet (Ahlberg; col. 3, lines 14-17).

As per claim 19 and 44, Marsh in view of Maltseff both fail to explicitly disclose wherein users operating the additional remote client computer systems are provided specialized access depending upon login information received by the asset management server computer system.

However Ahlberg discloses specialized access depending upon login information received (col. 15, lines 34-51).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Marsh in view of Maltseff to include specialized access depending upon login information received as taught by Ahlberg. The motivation to combine is the same as claim 18 and 43, above.

Claim 21, 23, 46 and 48 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marsh (US 2003/0023517 A1) in view of Maltseff

(US 2002/00997282 A1) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Cannon, Jr. et al. (US 5,689,238).

As per claim 21 and 46, Marsh in view of Maltseff fails to explicitly disclose determining whether a selected electronic asset identification device is within a range of the interrogation device; indicating the presence of the selected electronic asset identification device to the user; and enhancing the indication of the presence of the selected electronic asset identification device upon increasing proximity to the selected electronic asset identification device.

However Cannon discloses determining whether a selected electronic asset identification device is within a range of the interrogation device (col. 2, lines 42-59); indicating the presence of the selected electronic asset identification device to the user (col. 2, lines 42-59); and enhancing the indication of the presence of the selected electronic asset identification device upon increasing proximity to the selected electronic asset identification device (col. 2, lines 42-59).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Marsh in view of Maltseff to include determining whether a selected electronic asset identification device is within a

range of the interrogation device; indicating the presence of the selected electronic asset identification device to the user; and enhancing the indication of the presence of the selected electronic asset identification device upon increasing proximity to the selected electronic asset identification device as taught by Cannon. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings in order to allow for random storage of items and useful for locating misplaced items (Cannon; col. 1, lines 43-46).

As per claim 23 and 48, Marsh discloses an interrogation device that communicates and corresponds information with the asset management server (0021-0022 and 0028).

Marsh in view of Maltseff fails to explicitly disclose receiving an asset location area description and scanning the asset location area to identify the presence therein of electronic asset identification devices.

However Cannon discloses receiving an asset location area description (col. 3, lines 27-45) and scanning the asset location area to identify the presence therein of electronic asset identification devices (col. 3, lines 27-45).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings

of Marsh in view of Maltseff to include receiving an asset location area description, scanning the asset location area to identify the presence therein of electronic asset identification devices as taught by Cannon. The motivation to combine is the same as claim 21 and 46, above.

Claim 22 and 47 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marsh (US 2003/0023517 A1) in view of Maltseff (US 2002/00997282 A1).

As per claim 22 and 47, Marsh discloses presenting interpreted data through the user interface: the interrelated data being meaningful information regarding the tracked asset (0028).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Marsh to include displaying asset management information regarding a selected asset, wherein the asset management information includes an indication regarding whether the selected asset has been confirmed; an indication that the selected asset has an electronic asset identification device affixed thereto; an indication regarding the presence of the affixed electronic asset identification; and an indication

regarding the storage status of the selected asset. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify the teachings in order to provide information related to the asset. **The Examiner would like to note limitations recited in claim 47 are directed to design choice for providing information catered to a specific environment.**

Claims 25 and 50 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marsh (US 2003/0023517 A1) in view of Maltseff (US 2002/00997282 A1) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Radican (US 6,148,291).

As per claim 25 and 50, Marsh in view of Maltseff fails to explicitly disclose receiving user confirmation that a selected asset has been received; and receiving exception information relating to the selected asset.

However Radican discloses receiving user confirmation that a selected asset has been received (col. 5, lines 43-44); and receiving exception information relating to the selected asset (FIG. 10A and 10B).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Marsh in view of Maltseff to include receiving user

confirmation that a selected asset has been received; and receiving exception information relating to the selected asset as taught by Radican. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings in order to track the delivery of assets and to monitor the assets (Marsh; col. 2, lines 40-42).

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Asfand M. Sheikh whose telephone number is (571)272-1466. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8a-4:30p.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ryan M. Zeender can be reached on (571) 272-6790. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/F. Ryan Zeender/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit
3627

Asfand M Sheikh
Examiner
Art Unit 3627

/Asfand M Sheikh/
Examiner, Art Unit 3627